



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

times. Let us have the New Testament books—nay, all the writings of primitive Christianity—in the place and conditions and circumstances of their origin, in their relation to the historical progress of ecclesiastical thought and life in the various branches of the church. For what Pfeiderer has given let us be grateful, and let us look for more to come.

BENJAMIN W. BACON.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL,  
New Haven, Conn.

---

### RECENT LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

WHAT Huck endeavored to do for students of the Greek New Testament has been done in France for Bible readers in general by Morel and Chastand.<sup>1</sup> One is attracted to this latest arrangement of the gospel text by the first word on the cover—"concordance." The authors do not attempt another "harmony;" but believing that a careful comparison of the first three gospels constitutes "the best and most accessible commentary on the text," they give, under 136 appropriate headings, a translation of the synoptic text, with only such passages from John as run parallel with the earlier narratives. The book is polychrome. Mark's column is uncolored, his text being regarded as the oldest; Matthew's is pink, and Luke's green. Material from the fourth gospel has a yellow ground. For convenience and attractiveness—not unimportant qualities of any book—this concordance is admirable. Yet it is something more than a simple comparative arrangement of the text; it contains a considerable number of interpretative notes. One class of these refers to current Protestant and Catholic translations of the gospels into French, of which there are no less than thirteen. Another class, in larger type, gives carefully selected passages of Scripture that bear on the understanding of the text, *e. g.*, the original of the quotations, in some instances according to the LXX as well as according to the Hebrew. There are some critical notes on important variants and on other textual phenomena, but these are subordinated to the practical aim of the book. As to the chronological arrangement of the text it may be noted that the rejection in Nazareth is placed by the side of Mark 6:1-6, and not, as even the seventh edition of Broadus<sup>2</sup> gives it, in connection with Matt. 4:13. The Johannean

<sup>1</sup> *Concordance des évangiles synoptiques.* Par ERNEST MOREL ET GÉDÉON CHASTAND. Lausanne: Bridel, 1902. 140 pages.

<sup>2</sup> *A Harmony of the Gospels in the Revised Version.* By JOHN A. BROADUS. Revised by ARCHIBALD THOMAS ROBERTSON. New York: Armstrong & Son, 1903. xvii + 290 pages.

cleansing of the temple is given with the synoptic, as though another version of the same event.

A new edition of Blass's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*<sup>3</sup> shows improvement in numerous points. The book has been reset and more attractively than at first. The new edition has nineteen pages more than the first, and the new page is slightly larger than the old. The spelling of numerous German words has been changed, and greater uniformity has thus been secured. Where the first edition wrote *korrekt* the second has *korrekt*. Instead of the letter *c* in words where the consonant is soft, we have *z*, thus *zitat* for *citat*, and *soziativen* for *sociativen*, and when the letter is hard, it seems to be represented always by *k*. The additional material seems to be distributed pretty evenly through the book. Footnotes have been expanded, and new ones added. References to discoveries and investigations made since 1896 are met on every hand, which indicates plainly that the new edition marks a real advance upon the old.

One of the early Christian Fathers, in reply to the question what new thing Jesus had brought to the world, said the new that he brought was himself. With this agrees the thought of a Jewish rabbi of the present day, who in attempting to account for the origin of Christianity, finds the supreme cause in the personality of Jesus.<sup>4</sup> He had an "unusual self-consciousness," a "rare measure of humility and modesty," and unlike the other messiahs, he gave himself to the poor and wretched. The loyalty and admiration of his disciples were so great that they survived the Master's death. Faith in his return united them, and thus within Judaism the new sect arose. The doctrines of the gospel have nothing essentially new. Even the Lord's Prayer can be produced word for word from Jewish sources. The separation of this sect from Judaism was due chiefly to two facts—the influence of Paul, who rejected both law and tradition, and the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. This event was also the destruction of the ritual of sacrifice, but the Pauline doctrine of the sacrificial death of Jesus became for the new sect a satisfactory substitute. Dr. Vogelstein concedes that Christianity has rendered one great service to the world, viz., that of teaching men faith in one God.

<sup>3</sup> *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Von FRIEDRICH BLASS. Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902. xii + 348 pages.

<sup>4</sup> *Die Anfänge des Talmuds und die Entstehung des Christenthums*. Vortrag von HERMANN VOGELSTEIN. Königsberg i. Pr.: Ostdeutsche Buchhandlung, 1902. 28 pages.

Among the striking evidences of the interest of the world in the life of Jesus is the fact that during the past fifteen years there has been a minute investigation of all early literature to discover every word that the Master may have spoken, which was not gathered into the canonical gospels. The results of such investigation, together with the Fayoom and Behnesa Fragments, constitute the most valuable part of *The Extra-Canonical Life of Christ*.<sup>5</sup> This is not a new edition of the author's book on the same subject published in 1887, but rather a new work. The first two parts give the apocryphal material concerning the early life, the death and resurrection of Jesus; Part III contains "Miscellaneous Records," as the Abgar and Pilate documents; and Part IV, the sayings of Jesus. Parts I and IV have each a bibliographical introduction. The sayings of Jesus, 127 in number, are accompanied with references to the respective sources.

One of the fundamental questions in the life of Jesus, one which has scarcely begun to be critically studied among us, is the question of his origin. This has recently been discussed in a significant pamphlet by Soltau.<sup>6</sup> Accepting as a sure result of the historical study of the gospels that Matthew and Luke had, as their chief sources, Mark and a collection of the words of Jesus, his aim is to separate the genuine elements of the old tradition regarding the birth of Jesus from the legendary additions. Mark and Paul, to some extent also Acts and John, go back to earlier sources regarding the childhood of Jesus than the early chapters of Matthew and Luke. Mark appears to exclude the supernatural origin of Jesus (6:1; 3:21). Acts speaks of Nazareth as his birthplace (3:6; 4:10), and appears to exclude a conception by the Holy Spirit in that it represents the man Jesus as *anointed* with the spirit (10:37). Paul represents Jesus as descended from David in the male line (*e. g.*, Rom. 1:3; 9:5), and the statement in Gal. 4:4 that Jesus was made of a woman simply affirms his humanity. The earlier part of John, and even some passages in Matthew and Luke themselves (*e. g.*, the genealogical lists and Matt. 13:55, 56), agree with this view of Mark and Paul. Further, an old Syriac text of Matt. 1:16 reads: "Joseph to whom the Virgin Mary was betrothed begat Jesus Christ." On the basis of this evidence Soltau gives as the true evangelic tradition that "Jesus of Nazareth, legitimate son of Joseph and Mary, sprang from Galilee, a descendant from David according

<sup>5</sup> *The Extra-Canonical Life of Christ*. By BERNHARD PICK. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1903. 312 pages.

<sup>6</sup> *Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi*. Von WILHELM SOLTAU. Leipzig: Weicher, 1902. 43 pages.

to the common belief, was chosen by the wondrous higher Power to be the Messiah of his people and Savior of the whole world."

The starting-point of the Bethlehem story is found in Mic. 5:1, cited in Matt. 2:6. The story of the census is regarded as an attempt to explain the journey to Bethlehem. This narrative is thought to be highly improbable in itself. The most original part of Soltau's discussion of the legendary elements in Matthew and Luke is that which traces to a heathen origin the song of the angels, the visit of the magi, and the virgin birth. The first of these elements is an adaptation to Jesus of language which had been employed regarding Augustus. Inscriptions from Asia Minor (published in 1899) call Augustus the "savior," speak of his birthday as "the beginning of the gospel" concerning him, and describe his influence as producing "peace on earth" and concord among men.

Matthew's story of the magi is thought to have had its origin in the visit of Tiridates with his magi to Nero. The amazement of the civilized world caused by this tour became intelligible to the evangelist, late in the first century, only as he transferred the worship of the orientals from Nero to the Messiah. Even the detail of Matthew's narrative that the magi returned home "another way" is found in the account of the visit of Tiridates.

The starting-point of the teaching of a virgin birth is found in the dualistic conception of Christ in Paul and John. It is a translation of their philosophical Christology into sensuous terms intelligible to the common people. This translation was influenced by the prevalent and ancient view of pagan nations that their great men were descended from the gods.

Soltau mentions as against a Jewish origin of the doctrine of virgin birth the fact that the word for "Spirit" in Hebrew is feminine, and that in the Gospel of the Hebrews the Spirit is called the *mother* of Jesus. Finally, he opposes the teaching on religious grounds, holding that it is irreconcilable with Jesus' doctrine of God.

This pamphlet is doubtless far from being the final statement on the subject discussed. It does not cover all the ground, and some of its arguments are more curious than conclusive; but nevertheless it is a forcible presentation of a view which is pretty certain to receive increasing attention in America in coming years.

Of critical activity in the Roman Catholic church the first volume of Jacquier's introduction to the New Testament<sup>7</sup> presents interesting

<sup>7</sup> *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament*. Tome I. Par E. JACQUIER. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. 488 pages.

evidence. The author makes larger use of English works than is made by German scholars. His conclusions, though conservative, are defended in temperate language. The first volume, after discussing the chronology and language of the New Testament, treats of Paul and his writings, together with his epistle to the Hebrews, which is ascribed to a disciple of Paul.

What a canon of Westminster says to the English clergy about the gospels has an interest aside from that which it can claim in view simply of the ability of the speaker. It indicates how the methods and results of higher criticism are regarded in that church. Some of the results of Canon Robinson's<sup>8</sup> study are these: The second gospel was composed about 65 by Mark, and was one of the two chief literary sources of Matthew and Luke. On the authorship and date of the first gospel no definite opinion is expressed, though the author seems inclined to favor a date of composition late in the first century. The third gospel, the work of Luke, is put between 65 and a date soon after 70.

The second documentary source of Matthew and Luke—not to be called *logia*—was a succinct narrative like that of Mark, and is most satisfactorily preserved in Luke. The fourth gospel is ascribed to the apostle John, and is said to reveal to us "what the Christ grew to be in the mind of one who had leaned on his bosom in youth." Very great contrast between the synoptic narrative and John is freely admitted, and the author does not claim to be able to explain all the difficulties in the way of the traditional view. In an extended note on the titles of Christ the name "Son of God" is said to be "primarily messianic," and so the equivalent of "Son of man," but the author also speaks of the "height of its meaning," which is "sharply contrasted" with that of the more common title. Evidence of this higher meaning is found in four passages—Mark 8:38; 13:32; 14:6; and 15:39. What Dr. Robinson understands by this higher meaning is indicated in the paragraph regarding the centurion at the cross. He says that "through gentile lips we learn something more of the meaning of a title which might have remained for Jews a messianic phrase and nothing more. Not office, but nature—a divine relation, and not merely a divine commission—lies at the root of the title." Thus he seems to put into it the old theological significance, and, what passes comprehension, he does this on the testimony of the Roman centurion!

<sup>8</sup> *The Study of the Gospels*. By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1902. 161 pages.

One other point is most significant in its bearing on the doctrinal attitude of the book. The author has been speaking of Matthew's modification of his sources, and this leads to the question of the historicity of Matthew. Here, says he, "we must be careful at once to draw a distinction. It is one thing gratefully to accept the *authorized* interpretation of our Lord's meaning and *intention*<sup>9</sup> in sayings which had been preserved in an obscure or a paradoxical form. It is another thing to explore with the eye of the historical investigator, who seeks to trace the earliest sources, and to apply the ordinary tests of literary criticism." The "historian," he says, will prefer Mark, Luke, and the non-Markan document to Matthew. And yet Matthew is said to give an authorized interpretation of our Lord's meaning and intention. Is there, then, a truth to be discovered by historical investigation, and another truth, not historically established, which is to be "gratefully accepted" as an "authorized interpretation"? Shall we say this, or shall we say quite frankly that the results of historical investigation are not always in accord with ecclesiastical tradition, and that the tradition in such cases is to be rejected?

Unexpected confirmation of the prevailing views regarding the origin of the gospels is furnished by a German pamphlet of the past year.<sup>10</sup> That this confirmation is not intentional will appear from a glance at the position taken by the author.

He assumes the priority of John. This gospel gives a "complete and very clear survey of the life of Jesus," but it also leaves much unsaid. Luke set out to fill the gaps in John's narrative. The *πράγματα πεπληροφορημένα* of Luke 1:1 are "facts brought together for the sake of completeness," *i. e.*, to complete John. Matthew wrote with Luke before him, and filled up his gaps. Mark is regarded as inferior to Matthew in order and conscientiousness. The approximate dates given for the composition of the gospels are as follows: John, soon after 44; Luke, 53-57; Matthew, 60; and Mark, soon after 64. From the standpoint of New Testament criticism this hypothesis is to be classed with that view of the early church which regarded Matthew as the original gospel, to which the others furnished additions and corrections.

This hypothesis gives the pre-eminence among the gospels to the last. So also does Dr. E. A. Abbott in the published introduction to

<sup>9</sup> The italics are the reviewer's, not the author's.

<sup>10</sup> *Neue Untersuchungen über den Quellenwert der vier Evangelien.* Von W. KÜPPERS. Gross Lichterfelde-Berlin: Runge, 1902. 123 pages.

a still unpublished book," though he does not ascribe the gospel to the apostle John, nor even to an eyewitness. The unknown author "might well feel grievously perplexed" by the "obscurities, omissions, and variations" of Mark and the later evangelists. His object was to write a gospel "that should lift his readers out of the critical atmosphere into the region of adoring love." Again the nucleus of the discourses in John is said to be closer to the deeper doctrines of Christ than most synoptic tradition. Thus in various respects the value of the fourth gospel is emphasized by Dr. Abbott in comparison with that of the synoptists. The unknown author, though probably knowing that in some matters of detail his narrative was not true, was a real prophet, while the unknown author of Second Peter was a forger. The discussion of this point constitutes another chapter in *Contrast*, which the author appropriately calls "the skeleton of a book."

A linguistic argument bearing on the authorship of the fourth gospel is presented by Professor Schlatter.<sup>12</sup> His position is that the author assimilated his Greek to his Aramaic, and thus revealed a Palestinian home. To show this he makes an elaborate comparison of the language of the gospel with that of the Mechilta and Sifore. The evidence, taken as a whole, furnishes indeed an argument that the author was a Jew, but it is a question how far it implies that his home was in Palestine.

The recent literature on the prologue of John is extensive, but the conclusions reached are still most diverse. A late German writer seeks to maintain its Jewish character and its organic relation to the gospel.<sup>13</sup> It is held to treat exclusively of the historical Jesus Christ. When it says that the Logos became flesh (1:14), it means that the pre-historic person Jesus Christ appeared (*erstand*) as a man. The prologue falls into three sections, of which the first (vss. 1-5) treats of redemption as a revelation of God, the second (vss. 6-13) of redemption as a historical appearance, and the third (vss. 14-18) of redemption as a personal experience. The ideas of the prologue are thought to have been based on utterances of Jesus, and to have been confirmed by the author's experience. These ideas do not partake of metaphysical

<sup>11</sup> *Contrast; or, A Prophet and a Forger*. By EDWIN A. ABBOTT. London: Black, 1903. xxxii+41 pages.

<sup>12</sup> *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*. Von A. SCHLATTER. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1902. 180 pages.

<sup>13</sup> *Der Prolog des Johannes Evangeliums*. Von K. MEYER. Leipzig: Deichert, 1902. 98 pages.



speculation, but are judgments based on historical events and personal experiences. These statements may serve to indicate the author's position—a position which, I think, it is wholly impossible to fortify by appeal to the teaching of Jesus, even as that is given in the fourth gospel.

The composition of the first chapter of Luke has again been made the subject of discussion.<sup>14</sup> This chapter is held to be a compilation of two documents, one narrating the birth of the Baptist and the other the birth of Jesus. The motive of the compiler was to show that from the first the inferiority of the Baptist to Jesus had been recognized. This position of course implies that when the compilation was made there was a considerable body of people who exalted the Baptist at least to an equality with Jesus—a view which must be regarded as without historical foundation.

The long search for Ænon and for Bethany beyond Jordan has been renewed by a German pastor.<sup>15</sup> In the location of Ænon he starts from Eusebius and Jerome, who give its distance from Scythopolis. Eusebius says it lay *πρὸς νότον*, and Mommert thinks this expression may denote southeast as well as due south. Then on the basis of Silvia Aquitania, Placentinus of the sixth century, and the mosaic of Madeba, also of the sixth century, all of which point to a location east of the Jordan, he searched, in August, 1902, in the Wady Jabis for a site answering to John's topographical note and to the testimony of these early witnesses. This he found at Ain Dschirm, where in the hottest season he saw five springs whose united waters formed a large brook. Ruins on a hill near by he identified with Salim on the ground that Eusebius spoke of a Salim in Moab. This Ain Dschirm was in the territory of Antipas, where consequently John might readily have been seized. It is about eight Roman miles from Scythopolis and two from the Jordan, which accords with the language of Eusebius and Placentinus. Unfortunately Mommert does not touch the point that according to John 3 : 26, compared with 1 : 28, Ænon was on the *west* side of Jordan.

The identification of Bethany appears to me more successful. In September, 1902, Mommert discovered certain ruins on the east side of

<sup>14</sup> *A Johannine Document in the First Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel.* By J. R. WILKINSON. London: Luzac & Co., 1902. 40 pages.

<sup>15</sup> *Ænon und Bethania, die Taufstätten des Täufers, nebst einer Abhandlung über Salem die Königstadt des Melchisedek.* Von CARL MOMMERT. Leipzig: Haberland, 1903. vi+97 pages.

Jordan, nearly opposite Jericho, which he identified with the small square church which Theodosius says was built by Emperor Anastasius on the spot where Jesus was baptized. The description of these ruins permits us to think the identification a probable one. The ruins are about five Roman miles from the Dead Sea, which agrees with the Burdigaleusian Itinerary of 333 A. D. The walls rest on arches, now nearly buried in the earth, which harmonizes with the statement of Placentinus that the church stood in the water. Opposite the ruins, on the west side of Jordan, on high ground, stands the convent of John the Baptist, built on old foundations which Mommert identifies with the convent spoken of in the sixth century. Finally, it is held probable that there was once a ford here, for it is at the mouth of the Wady el-Kelt, and almost all the fords of the Jordan, says Mommert, were at the mouths of its tributaries. The Jordan is not fordable at this place now, but may well have been when its waters were divided between the three beds, two of which are dry at present. Such is Mommert's highly interesting and valuable argument. C. R. Conder, in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, says that the traditional site of Bethany east of Jericho is "clearly much too far south," but he gives no reason for this statement. Mommert's argument is not weakened by the fact that there are no signs of an ancient village on the east of Jordan near the ruins of the church. One cannot infer from John 1:28 that Bethany was the name of a *village*, as Smith does in his *Physical Geography of Palestine*, p. 542, note. The evangelist does not say that John baptized in *the* Bethany *which* was beyond Jordan, thus contrasting it with a Bethany on the west side of the river. He simply says it took place in Bethany beyond Jordan (*ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, not *τῇ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*). We may, therefore, with Mommert take Bethany as the name of the ford, and equivalent to Bethabara, "the place of crossing."

For the fourth time in twenty-two years Meyer's commentary on John has been revised by Weiss.<sup>16</sup> The changes in this new edition are changes of form rather than of interpretation. In order to give in a more connected manner the thought of the discourses of the gospel, the glossatorial method of comment is to some extent abandoned. It will surely be regarded as an improvement that the new edition drops the references to classical Greek which had been thought to throw light on the language of the evangelist. These are now

<sup>16</sup> *Das Johannes-Evangelium*. Von der 6. Auflage neu bearbeitet von BERNHARD WEISS. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902. 543 pages.

regarded as without weight and misleading. The critical text of Tregelles and that of Westcott-Hort is introduced with other authorities. One could wish that the new edition had given more space to recent studies in the gospel, even if it had been necessary on that account to drop the discussion of earlier works, and one could also wish that it had contained more extensive reference to the English and American literature.

A new edition of the Meyer commentary on the prison epistles of Paul has been prepared by Haupt, five years after his first edition.<sup>17</sup> The form of the book remains unchanged, but the author says that on many points he has changed his opinion, and that the changes have been due largely to the writings of B. Weiss and Zahn. The arrangement of the text is not so convenient as that of the new volume on John, for the chapter and verse are well-nigh crowded off the page, and are not specially distinguished by the type.

A new commentary on Paul's epistles, from Galatians to Philemon, based on the English text, has been prepared by G. W. Clark.<sup>18</sup> Its interpretation of Paul's teachings has not been greatly influenced by modern criticism.

The new edition of Meyer's Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, the second prepared by Weiss, shows little important alteration.<sup>19</sup> It takes account of the work of Lilley and Krukenberg, and in the introduction the author has referred to some recent publications, chiefly, if not exclusively, German. Obviously, therefore, it does not give the reader a survey of all the important recent investigation of these epistles.

Was Paul acquainted with the Lord's Prayer, and did he use it himself, especially its fifth petition? The fact that Paul has no perfectly clear reference to the Lord's Prayer, or to any particular part of it, together with the fact that he lays great stress on the duty of giving thanks, makes it natural to ask this question, and suggests the importance of investigating it. Bindemann undertakes this investigation in a compact pamphlet of a hundred pages.<sup>20</sup> In his study of the fifth

<sup>17</sup> *Die Gefangenschaftsbriege*. Von der 7., bzw. 6., Auflage an neu bearbeitet von ERICH HAUPT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902. 103 + 198 + 247 + 180 pages.

<sup>18</sup> *Clark's People's Commentary*: Galatians-Philemon. By GEO. W. CLARK. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1903. liv + 496 pages.

<sup>19</sup> *Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus*. Von der 5. Auflage an neu bearbeitet von BERNHARD WEISS. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902. 379 pages.

<sup>20</sup> *Das Gebet um tägliche Vergebung der Sünden*, in der Heilsverkündigung Jesu und in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus. Von GERHARD BINDEMANN. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1902. 105 pages.

petition of the Lord's Prayer he emphasizes the messianic character of the prayer as a whole. The addition to the fifth petition he does not regard as a vow, nor as an independent condition of the divine forgiveness, but rather as a necessary element of faith in the unlimited grace of God. The discussion of Paul's relation to the Lord's Prayer enters fully into the apostle's doctrine of sin in the Christian life, from which he concludes that Paul not only knew the fifth petition, but also prayed it in the sense in which Jesus taught his disciples to use it. It is regarded as a matter of chance that the writings of Paul contain no explicit reference to the Lord's Prayer. A probable allusion to its last petition is seen in 2 Tim. 4:18, and an allusion to its opening words in the "Abba Father" of Rom. 8:15 and Gal. 4:6.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

#### RECENT LITERATURE IN SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

THE chief activity of theologians today is devoted to the problem of getting our bearings in the modern world. It is generally felt that until we see more clearly the significance of the discoveries of modern psychology and biology, and until we know better the meaning of the history of doctrine, the time for confident efforts at systematization will not arrive. Consequently systematic productions come today, as a rule, only from those who have not felt the disturbing influence of modern scientific procedure. Dr. Weidner's treatise<sup>1</sup> represents this position. The book is both syllabus and compendium. It contains in outline a doctrine of God, biblically, ecclesiastically, and constructively set forth. It is founded on a combination of reason and revelation, much after the fashion of Thomas Aquinas. Some things are only supernaturally known, but are yet corroborated by reason; other things are supernaturally and rationally known; still others are rationally known, but are to be accepted because supernaturally authenticated; so reason proves the truth of revelation and revelation the truth of reason. The author puts his trust in the Aristotelian-Thomistic arguments for the existence of God—though it does not quite appear that he does so because the church decreed that these arguments have scientific validity. He has no difficulty in finding ecclesiastical trinitarianism and Christology in the sacred Scriptures. In no single point does one detect that the theology set forth in this volume has been in

<sup>1</sup>*Theologia, or the Doctrine of God*. Outline Notes based on Luthardt. By REVERE FRANKLIN WEIDNER. Chicago: Revell, 1902. 143 pages. \$0.75.